

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sasmazel *et al.* (U.S. 6,032,260). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 was amended to clarify that the "electronic ticket" as claimed is *different* from the "network electronic ticket" (see lines 6-7). The "electronic ticket" recited by the claim is for "receiving necessary permission, a commodity, or service from a provider" (lines 2-3), while the "network electronic ticket" is for "receiving online information service from an information providing apparatus on a network" (lines 5-6).

In contrast, Sasmazel teaches a *single* "eticket" that is used for authenticating and authorizing a requested operation, such as a request to view a web page or a protected document. See FIG. 7 and accompanying text. Sasmazel does *not* teach a "network electronic ticket" *different from* the "electronic ticket", and thus cannot teach all of the elements of claim 1.

Further, The eticket as taught by Sasmazel is used to provide trusted authentication functionality to Internet based transactions. See col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 20. As such, the eticket of Sasmazel is an extension of the functionality of the Secure Socket Layer (SSL) of the World-Wide-Web to further ensure that only authorized transactions take place for protected resources. This type of operation occurs in the background, typically transparent to the user. There is no suggestion of an electronic equivalent to paper tickets, for example.

The "electronic ticket" of the invention, however, are meant to provide functionality similar to that provided by *paper* tickets, for example, such as allowing access to an event (or the purchase of a service or commodity). The "network electronic ticket" is further provided for access to online information, such as

information about the event (or service or commodity), for example. Sasmazel does not suggest using its eticket to obtain access to an event (or service or commodity) for a user. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the reference.

Similarly, claim 17, as amended, recites limitations similar to those discussed for claim 1, and thus claim 17 is patentable over the reference for the same reasons discussed for claim 1. Claims 2-16, which depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1 and claims 18-36, which depend, directly or indirectly on claim 17, are all patentable over the references for the same reasons as their parent claims.


New claims 38 and 39 also contain the limitation that the network electronic ticket" be different from the "electronic ticket" (at lines 6-7 and 4-5, respectively), and thus those claims are patentable over the reference for the same reasons discussed for claim 1, above. Claims 40 and 41, being directly or indirectly dependent on claim 39, are patentable for the same reasons.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32808.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

September 30, 2002

Claim Amendments with Editing Marks

1. (twice amended) A networked-linked electronic ticket comprising:
at least one electronic ticket for receiving necessary permission, a commodity,
or service from a provider; and
at least one network electronic ticket different from the at least one electronic
ticket for receiving online information service from an information
providing apparatus on a network.

17. (amended) An electronic ticket wallet comprising:
ticket storage means for storing a network-linked electronic ticket ~~containing~~
including:
an electronic ticket for receiving necessary permission, a commodity,
or service from a provider; and
a network electronic ticket different from the electronic ticket for
receiving online information service from an information
providing apparatus on a network;

and

information service reception means for receiving the online information
service from the information providing apparatus using the network
electronic ticket.